

well-deserved honors. Mr. Burrell had never received those medals due to a paperwork error. Because of Seth's work, we were finally able to present this Ohio veteran with the honors he had earned for serving our country.

There are so many stories like that one of American heroes finally receiving the honors and the Federal benefits they have earned. So many of those stories are because of Seth's hard work.

Seth Pringle does so much for the people of Ohio, and at the end of the week, when others might look forward to a relaxing weekend with friends and family, Seth often is headed out for drill with his unit.

Now Seth's unit is deploying. While we will miss his expertise, his dedication, and his unique perspective in the office this year, we are so grateful for his service to our country.

On behalf of everyone in my office and on behalf of Ohio's 12 million citizens, we wish Seth Pringle well in his tour overseas—and all of his unit, of course. We thank him for his sacrifice and his service.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING DAVID MILES KNIGHT AND BERNER RICHARD JOHNSON III

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we have two bits of sad news about longtime Senate employees.

David Miles Knight, a beloved barber in our barbershop and one of the Senate's master barbers for the last 36 years, lost a lengthy battle with cancer.

His most noticeable and notable trait was kindness—not just friendliness but actual kindness—and a generosity of spirit. He was always eager to ask about a customer's day or a colleague's weekend and was just as eager to regale those folks with stories about his family—of Joanne, his wife; of his three sons; of his eight grandchildren; and of his two great-grandchildren. Dave's life was filled with these people—his friends and his family.

I offer my prayers to them now—to Dave's family, his friends, and his Senate family. He was considered a member of the Senate family and had been here for decades. He was beloved. We miss him.

Berner Richard Johnson III, a staff member for 30 years, known to all here

as “Bud,” also passed away last night. He was a victim of a violent crime last week in DC and recently succumbed to the injuries this crime involved.

Bud was beloved by his Senate family, the softball team he coached, and his many friends and family. I offer my prayers for Diane, his partner; for Bo, his son; and for all who loved him and who will miss him.

May the memory of these two men be a blessing to their loved ones and a reminder to all of us that life is fleeting and to hold tight to those we love.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on disaster relief, millions of Americans have waited long enough for their government to provide relief in the wake of recent natural disasters. We have 1 week left in this work period. This is crunch time. It will be an awful conclusion to this work period if we leave without passing a relief package. We must focus on concluding our negotiations and reaching consensus on our final legislation.

That is why I am alarmed by rumors that the Republican majority may attach a simple extension of the Violence Against Women Act to the disaster bill rather than to the new reform bill that was passed by a huge bipartisan majority in the House. That is a formula for deadlock when we pass it here and send it to the House, but they will not vote for it.

Why do we have to load up the disaster bill with extraneous provisions, especially those that might bring conflict?

We must be very careful not to allow this and other extraneous provisions to get on the bill that have opposition from Members. It would only imperil the success of bipartisan disaster relief. We have come to a conclusion on Puerto Rico, and I am glad our Republican friends have finally seen the light and have not treated Puerto Rico unfairly so that we can move forward with all disaster relief.

The President sent over a proposal on the border, and we have sent back a counter proposal with many of the things—but not all—that he included. Some are objectionable. That is extraneous, but we might be able to come to an agreement on that.

These other extraneous provisions? Our Republican leader has said that he wants to get this done Thursday. Well, a surefire way of not doing it is jamming the House, filling it up with provisions that would not pass the House.

So let's all roll up our sleeves, get to work, refrain from our desires to put other things on this must-pass bill, and get disaster relief done. We Democrats will work in good faith to resolve all the remaining issues. But before the week is out, let's get a bill we can vote on. Let's deliver relief to disaster-stricken Americans and put an end to what has been a needlessly partisan episode.

WOMEN'S HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on women's health and a woman's right to choose and the judges we are appointing, the past week marked a low point for our country on the issue of women's reproductive rights.

While an overwhelming majority of Americans want to keep *Roe v. Wade*, a total of 30 States have now sought to restrict the rights of women to make their own healthcare decisions, and some would either directly or virtually undo the *Roe v. Wade* decision. Alabama's Republicans have passed the most extreme example—that is the one I was talking about—but Republicans in Missouri and Texas are not far behind. And this is not merely a few fringe politicians making a statement way out of the mainstream; this is a systematic effort by Republicans in State legislatures to restrict women's reproductive rights and ultimately overturn *Roe v. Wade*, even though the vast majority of Americans don't want that to happen.

Meanwhile, here in the Senate, Leader MCCONNELL has lined up a conveyor belt of far-right judges who have reprehensible records on women's rights.

Last week, the Republican majority considered a judge, Kenneth Lee of California. Here is what he said about sexism. He said it is “irrelevant pouting.” Tell that to women who have been discriminated against in so many different ways that we read about. How about Ms. Wendy Vitter? All of our Republican friends voted to put this woman on the bench. She once promoted the idea that contraceptives cause cancer and claimed that Planned Parenthood kills 150,000 women a year. Both were confirmed to lifetime appointments. It is incredible. These are people way on the extreme—way on the extreme.

And here comes another one. The Senate is voting on yet another judge with a horrendous record on women's rights—Mr. Daniel Collins, nominated to the Ninth Circuit over the objection of both of his home State Senators. He has defended the rights of pregnancy clinics to withhold from their patients that they don't provide abortion services and filed an amicus brief in support of the Hobby Lobby's petition to deny its female employees contraceptive care. He is a longtime donor and member of the Federalist Society, and he has ensconced himself in one of the most anti-choice organizations in the entire country. Let's make no mistake about it—to read some of the articles about the Federalist Society, it was formed with the goal of curtailing women's rights. Many of its advocates believe that *Roe v. Wade* should be repealed.

Let me just call out my friends on the Republican side. When the Alabama law came about, the vast majority of my friends on the other side stayed silent about the extreme anti-abortion measure in Alabama and some of the other States, and then some

said: We oppose what Alabama does. At the same time, they are rubberstamping judges who would do the same thing—repeal Roe. There is a direct contradiction here. There is hypocrisy. Republicans who say they don't like the Alabama decision and then vote for judges who would ratify and repeal Roe or cut back so dramatically on Roe that it hardly exists are engaged in subterfuge. They say: Watch this hand. I am saying that I am not that extreme. Don't watch this hand where I am putting extreme judges on the bench who will do exactly what I say I am opposed to.

It is outrageous. They will be caught. It is outrageous that they are on the bench.

CHINA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, finally, on Huawei, there is positive news about an administrative action. I am in full support of what the Commerce Department did on Huawei, and I want to give a shout-out to Google for joining in and urge all other American companies to join as well. The administration issued an Executive order laying the groundwork to ban the purchase of telecommunications equipment from China's state-controlled firms. The decision, as I said, is having an impact because of Google. We are waiting for other companies to join in.

For years, China has prevented great American technology companies like Google, Facebook, and so many others from operating in China. They put barrier after barrier in the way because we are better, and they know American firms would capture the Chinese market. They put barriers in the way, they steal our technology and then develop it, and then even try to sell it back here. It has happened with computers. It has happened with so many other things that America and American know-how developed.

Huawei is a national security concern. It is a Chinese company that could pry into all of us. But it is also an excellent weapon to get China to finally start treating us fairly, which they haven't done for 30 years. We have lost tens of millions of good-paying American jobs and trillions of dollars because of what China has done to us. I have to say that both Democratic and Republican administrations in the past just sat there under some guise of free trade, which wasn't free or fair at all. And now we have some weapons.

A lot of these folks—these pundits, these critics, these editorial writers—say tariffs is the wrong way to go. Talking is the wrong way to go. It got us nowhere. But one other way to go is reciprocity.

China, we are going to treat some of your companies the way you treat our companies.

That is what we did with Huawei. It was the first time I have seen something very strong. I hope the President doesn't back off. He did with ZTE be-

cause President Xi asked him to. The head of China asked him to.

Don't back off, Mr. President.

This is the right thing to do, and I have been advocating for decades. I asked President Bush and President Obama to use reciprocity as a tool to stop China. It is another tool in our toolkit and an effective one.

If China won't let our most productive companies compete in its markets, we shouldn't let China's state-driven companies compete in ours. They get subsidies from the state.

We should not give Huawei—particularly Huawei, which is a security concern as well—free reign in the United States. China has to learn something. It has to open up its markets if it wants access to ours. They talk about, oh, we are an affront to China because we are asking for fairness? Give me a break. Give me a break. We know what fairness is.

I believe the administration's decision to put pressure on China to reform its economic policies was very smart, and I am really glad they did it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to address the Chamber on an issue that is an issue of significant challenge and controversy now, and that is the escalating tensions between the United States and Iran. I want to make a couple of points, but let me summarize the points as I then address the current challenge.

First, I think it would be absolute lunacy for the United States to get involved in another war right now in the Middle East. I think it would be devastating if we were to be in a war with Iran. In particular, it would be not only devastating but also, in my view, unconstitutional for us to be in a war with Iran at a President's say-so if the President were unwilling to have Congress have the debate, pursuant to our article I war powers in this Chamber and in the Chambers of the House of Representatives.

If this body has a considered debate in view of the American public and determines that we need to be in a war with Iran—or anyone, for that matter—however I vote is irrelevant. The vote of the body would be the vote that would express a political consensus about what America should do. But if the Chamber is unwilling to have that debate or a vote or if the President is unwilling to come to Congress so that the debate can be had in front of the American public, that should tell us

something. If we are not willing to have the vote or if the President doesn't want to bring it to Congress, that should suggest that maybe it is not a good idea.

That is the theme of what I want to talk about today. Why are we in a time of escalated tension between the United States and Iran? There are a number of reasons, but, bluntly, I believe the path to the current level of tension began when President Trump unilaterally walked out of a diplomatic deal.

I think our country should always prefer diplomacy to war. A President backing out of a diplomatic deal that our allies, our security officials, and the International Atomic Energy Agency said was working, in my view, was a horrible mistake.

There is a story I have told before in the Chamber, and it is a story I love. It is about one of my two favorite Presidents. One of my favorite Presidents is a Republican, Abraham Lincoln, and my other favorite President is Harry Truman. This is a Truman story.

After World War II, at one point, President Truman invited the press corps into his office, the Oval Office, and said: I have made an interesting decision today.

They wondered what the decision was. President Truman showed them that he had redesigned the seal of the Presidency of the United States.

The seal of the President was very similar to our Nation's seal of an eagle clutching the arrows of war in one claw and the olive branch of peace in the other claw. Prior to the Truman administration, the eagle's face had been turned toward the arrows of war. In the aftermath of World War II, when the United States was trying to exercise the role of not just military victor but now of a great peacemaker by forming the United Nations and other institutions to ensure that the carnage of World War II wouldn't be repeated, Harry Truman said: We should redesign the seal of the Presidency so that the United States is represented by an eagle whose face is looking toward the olive branches of peace.

We would always prefer peace. We would always prefer diplomacy. The arrows of war are still grasped in the eagle's claw. We are a nation of might, and we will use that might if we need it. But let no one in the world doubt what the preference of the United States is; that is, diplomacy and peace if that is possible and if that is honorable.

You can walk around the Senate Chamber, you can walk around the Capitol, and you can actually see both versions of the seal. You can still find some in the Capitol that were created before Harry Truman was President where you will still see the eagle's face directed toward the arrows. Many of them have been changed in subsequent years. It is interesting trivia—like a treasure hunt contest—for our pages and others. You can still find the old version.